



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,819	05/14/2007	Elke Zakel	7751P005	7190
7590 02/26/2010 Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman 7th Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025			EXAMINER NGUYEN, DUY T V	
			ART UNIT 2894	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/26/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action**  
**Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/581,819

**Applicant(s)**

ZAKEL ET AL.

**Examiner**

DUY T. NGUYEN

**Art Unit**

2894

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 22 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-3, 5-9 and 12-16.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Kimberly D Nguyen/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2894

/DUY T NGUYEN/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2894

Continuation Sheet of 11:

-In response to applicant's argument filed on 10/22/09, page 12 "Furthermore, even if Tanaka and Nakate combined..., as recited in claim 1", and pages 14-15 "Furthermore, even if Tanaka, Nakata, and Lutz were combined...., as recited in claim 9." The examiner respectfully disagrees.

-First, Tanaka teaches an IC chip (die) (7) having pad (8) in which a chip (die) is defined as piece of semiconductor wafer containing the entire circuit or a single piece of semiconductor containing entire integrated circuit which has not yet been packaged; equivalent term – chip (refer to <http://www.semi1source.com/glossary>, keyword: chip or die). Tanaka does also teach an IC mounting circuit substrate (considered as a wafer) including circuit conductor pattern (2) and IC pad junctioning bumps 3 (Fig. 1). The IC chip (die) and the IC mounting circuit substrate can be considered as two wafer like component composite arrangements. Tanaka also teaches YAG laser (col. 4, line 57).

-Second, Nakate teaches a composite arrangement of a plurality of diode lasers (laser beam irradiating apparatus or YAG laser welding, Figs. 1, 26, abstract and col. 1, lines 16-17) which are activated individual or in group to emit laser radiation (col. 1, lines 44-47, col. 2, lines 18-21, and col. 8, lines 31-40). Nakata does also teach "laser diode 1 or the optical system 6 is shifted" with respect to a position correcting welding point ((Figs. 8A-B, cols. 11-12).

-Third, Lutz teaches an infrared transmission alignment method and box 40 (Fig. 5) provides an x-y stage to move the wafer relative to the laser scanner or laser beam which either remains immobile or simultaneously moves (col. 5, lines 5-10, 15-16, col. 7, lines 66-67, and col. 8, lines 1-5).

-Therefore, given its broadest reasonable interpretation, Tanka/Nakate/Lutz meet the claimed invention.